

Date: Mon, 12 Jul 93 04:30:19 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #222  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Mon, 12 Jul 93                      Volume 93 : Issue    222

Today's Topics:

                                 antenna restrictions  
                                 Brilliant postings (2 msgs)  
                         Give a VE \$5.60, walk (Really, the semiannual CW war)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.  
-----

Date: Mon, 12 Jul 1993 10:19:43 GMT  
From: sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!news.dtc.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!hplextra!hplb!  
hpwin052!hpqmoea!dstock@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: antenna restrictions  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

"P"

"E"

"C"

"C"

"Your doing fine"

"A"

"D"

"I"

"L"

"L"

"O"

?

" Now, isnt their something that should come after that ?"

{ The man helps the boy add an "E" }

The devil made me do it,

David GM4ZNX

-----  
Date: Sun, 11 Jul 93 21:25:12 GMT

From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!jmaynard@uunet.uu.net

Subject: Brilliant postings

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <21pgi2INNaua@emx.cc.utexas.edu> oo7@emx.cc.utexas.edu (Derek Wills) writes:

>gary@ke4zv.uucp (Gary Coffman KE4ZV) proclaims:

>>>Morse remains in use by a few amateurs at HF

> A few? Well, lessee, there's a guy over in El Paso who uses

>it, and I hear tell that there are a couple of 'em in Dallas too.

>Mebbe even some old feller over Houston way.

Old? Harrrrrrumph.

> How can I take the rest of your postings seriously when you say

>stuff like this? A few?? You don't listen in the CW bands very much,

>do you? That is your choice, but just because I don't like phone

>operation very much I wouldn't say that "a few amateurs" use phone.

Gary has few scruples against hauling off and making completely unfounded statements of fact, based entirely on how he would like the world to be, rather than how it is...

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can  
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.

"iHaTeX." -- Andrew Burt

-----  
Date: Mon, 12 Jul 93 05:46:07 GMT

From: swrinde!gatech!hubcap!emory!rsiatl!jgd@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: Brilliant postings

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

jmaynard@nyx.cs.du.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:

>In article <21pgi2INNaua@emx.cc.utexas.edu> oo7@emx.cc.utexas.edu (Derek Wills) writes:

>>gary@ke4zv.uucp (Gary Coffman KE4ZV) proclaims:

>>>>Morse remains in use by a few amateurs at HF

>> A few? Well, lessee, there's a guy over in El Paso who uses

>>it, and I hear tell that there are a couple of 'em in Dallas too.

>>Mebbe even some old feller over Houston way.

>Gary has few scruples against hauling off and making completely unfounded  
>statements of fact, based entirely on how he would like the world to be,  
>rather than how it is...

And Jay seems to have little scruples against anything that can be done with the mouth. Particularly when it comes to Morris.

When I tune across the dial I hear maybe a couple hundred machine-generated CW conversations going on. One must presume this is computer to computer communications using an archaic signalling method only because it is mandated by equally archaic law. Interspersed amongst this stuff are a few obviously hand-generated signals. Gary's use of the word "few" was quite accurate.

Hey Jay. If you think old Morris is so popular, why don't you agree with us to deregulate it and let it sink or swim on its own merits. That it must have gov't protection tells me it is dead but the body just hasn't been buried yet.

John

--

John De Armond, WD40QC		(Pardon the inconvenience while we
Performance Engineering Magazine(TM)		remodel this .signature)
Marietta, Ga		
jgd@dixie.com		

-----

Date: Sun, 11 Jul 1993 20:53:44 GMT

From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!Csl!l

paulf@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: Give a VE \$5.60, walk (Really, the semiannual CW war)

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Gack. Do we really need to go over this issue every three months?

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."  
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, \_A Nation of Victims\_

-----  
Date: Sun, 11 Jul 1993 13:32:41 EST  
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!news@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul08.171208.129874@locus.com>,  
<930709.232727.5Q0.rusnews.w165w@hades.cdp.org>,  
<1993Jul10.164903.15522@ke4zv.uucp>  
Subject : Re: Coots at SBS (was Re: Lost petition for VHF/UHF beams)

gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:

>>This is your opinion. As for myself, well..... there are alot of things  
>>about amateur radio that need to be changed and I am working with  
>>several people to get things done. And no, I don't have any plans of  
>>dying soon and there's alot more to my life than amateur radio.

>>

>>Besides, last night I did my first VE session and found it very  
>>enlightening. Perhaps our thinking on the no-code issue many moons ago  
>>was somewhat flawed but we did bring up some good points. So now that  
>>THAT'S over with....

>

> That's one of the problems with newcomers who want to change the  
> world to fit their view, sometimes their view is just naive and  
> a bit of experience shows that they would have been making a terrible  
> mistake in trying to ram their naive ideas into law. That's not to  
> say that the newcomer is always wrong, just that a bit of experience  
> is often a useful validator.

[reply forthcoming on THIS one]

>>What Mike is trying to say is that little by little, the FCC is simply  
>>pissing away all control over amateur radio and leaving us to  
>>self-police the bands while they've taken the teeth out of enforcement  
>>issues. Ever try to get a known jammer nailed? Almost totally  
>>impossible.

>

> And it always was. The FCC has \*never\* vigorously enforced the amateur  
> regulations, it's just that previous generations of amateurs were, like  
> the rest of white middle class male society, more respectful of law.  
> It's the "cultural revolution", not a sudden lack of FCC action that  
> has changed amateur radio, just as it has changed all other aspects

> of society.

I don't believe that's the case. The FCC has simply had its budgets cut too steeply and can no longer afford to do some of the things they used to. Don't try to chalk it up to a "cultural revolution".

>>While I don't necessarily support the abolition of 13 & 20 WPM test, I  
>>do think that access to the voice portions should not be dependent upon  
>>morse code speed. Make it so if you want to access the lower ends of the  
>>CW band, you have to pass the 13 and 20WPM tests.

>

> Think about this for a moment Tony. To use the CW portions of the  
> band, an amateur has to be proficient in Morse. Without proficiency,  
> those band segments are useless to the amateur. Therefore testing  
> is irrelevant, either they can do it and do, or they can't, and don't.  
> The Morse test is just a silly formalism with no functional effect  
> in this context.

Ever listen in on those parts of the band? There're all sorts of code speeds, between 10 and 30WPM. I don't call it a silly formalism since if you took away the restrictions, you'd have the 5WPM people all over the place and there'd be no INCENTIVE to increase code speed. What you're essentially proposing is to eliminate incentive licensing, a bad idea at its best.

Tony

-----

Tony Pelliccio kd1nr/ae  
\*!\*!\*!\*!\*!\*!\*!\*!\*!\*  
system@garlic.sbs.com

"Usenet is like a herd of performing elephants  
with diarrhea -- massive, difficult to  
redirect, awe-inspiring, entertaining, and a  
source of mind-boggling amounts of excrement  
when you least expect it." --spaf (1992)

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #222

\*\*\*\*\*